



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,854	01/16/2004	Sreenivas Addagatta	042933/271712	6954
826 7590 04/04/2008				
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000				
EXAMINER WHIPPLE, BRIAN P				
ART UNIT 2152		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/04/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,854

Applicant(s)

ADDAGATLA ET AL.

Examiner

Brian P. Whipple

Art Unit

2152

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11, 12 and 16-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11, 12 and 16-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7, 11-12, 16-27 are pending in this application and presented for examination. Claims 8-10 and 13-15 have been cancelled by Applicant's amendment filed on 1/23/08. Claims 22-27 have been newly added by the same amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, with respect to claims 1 and 16, filed 11/26/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. As to claims 1 and 16, Applicant argues Sakai fails to disclose the claimed subject matter, because Sakai discloses factors related to battery power vs. external power and final destination, as opposed to data transfer rates at which first and second hosts are capable of transmission and reception.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is directed to Fig. 6 of Sakai. Sakai clearly discloses the PC is capable of a performance of 400Mbps, the DVC is capable of 100Mbps, and the VCR is capable of 400Mbps. Communication between any combination of the three is adjusted to the maximum available transfer rate between the three.

Art Unit: 2152

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-11, filed 11/26/07, with respect to the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of the rejection of claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3-4, 11, 16, 22-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/e) as being anticipated by Sakai, U.S. Patent No. 6,665,810 B1.

7. As to claim 1, Sakai discloses a communications system comprising:

a first host capable of transmitting multiplexed data at a first data transfer rate (Fig. 6, item 3);

a second host capable of receiving multiplexed data at a second data transfer rate (Fig. 6, item 2);

a data throttle, wherein the data throttle limits the first data transfer rate to a throttle value that is less than or equal to the lesser one of the first data transfer rate and the second data transfer rate (Fig. 6; Col. 6, ln. 37-50).

8. As to claim 3, Sakai discloses the throttle value transfer rate is obtained during a communications set-up period (Col. 5, ln. 43-61).

9. As to claim 4, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claims 1 and 3 above.

10. As to claim 11, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 3 above.

11. As to claims 16, 22-23, and 26, the claims are rejected for similar reasons to claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2152

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2, 19, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sakai as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Lin et al. (Lin), U.S. Patent No. 6,405,256 B1.

14. As to claim 2, Sakai discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 above, including a first data transfer rate (Fig. 6, item 3) and a second data transfer rate (Fig. 6, item 2), wherein a data throttle limits the first data transfer rate to a throttle value that is less than or equal to the lesser one of the first data transfer rate and the second data transfer rate (Fig. 6; Col. 6, ln. 37-50).

Sakai is silent on the network having a third data transfer rate and limiting the throttle value based on the third data transfer rate.

However, Lin discloses the network having a third data transfer rate (Col. 3, ln. 8-28) and limiting the throttle value based on the third data transfer rate (Col. 3, ln. 8-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Sakai by throttling based on a third data transfer rate as taught by Lin in order to adjust data transfer rates to avoid congestion (Lin: Col. 3, ln. 8-28).

15. As to claims 19 and 24-25, the claims are rejected for similar reasons to claims 1-2 above.

16. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai as applied to claim 11 above, in view of what was well known in the art.

17. As to claim 12, Sakai discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 11, but does not explicitly disclose SIP.

Official Notice (See MPEP 2144.03) is taken that Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) is a well known protocol for creating sessions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Sakai and Lin by using SIP as is well known in the art for the purposes of using a standard protocol to create sessions in a networking environment.

18. Claims 5-7, 17-18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai as applied to claims 1, 16, in view of Bach et al. (Bach), U.S. Patent No. 5,619,650.

19. As to claim 5, Sakai discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 above, but is silent on an applications layer, a sockets layer, a transport layer, and a network layer.

However, Bach discloses an applications layer, a sockets layer, a transport layer, and a network layer (Fig. 1; Abstract, ln. 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Sakai by explicitly disclosing the OSI model as this is a well known standard means for communication among multiple devices (Bach: Col. 1, ln. 53-61). Additionally, it is well known to establish a sockets layer by distributing API through the session layer (Bach: Abstract, ln. 4-7) for the purposes of establishing communication across applications on different systems (Bach: Col. 2, ln. 58-61).

20. As to claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 5 above.

21. As to claim 7, Sakai and Bach disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 5, including the transport layer is comprised of a User Datagram Protocol (UDP) and the network layer is comprised of an Internet Protocol (IP) (Bach: Col. 2, ln. 43-48).

22. As to claims 17 and 27, the claims are rejected for similar reasons to claim 6 above.
23. As to claim 18, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 7 above.
24. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai and Lin as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Bach.
25. As to claim 20, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 6 above.
26. As to claim 21, the claim is rejected for similar reasons to claim 7 above.

Conclusion

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2152

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple

/B. P. W./

Examiner, Art Unit 2152

3/30/08

/Bunjoo Jaroenchonwanit/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152